

REMARKS/AGRUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed September 3, 2003.

Claims 1-31 are pending.

Claims 1, 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 23, 26, and 27 have been amended.

Claim 31 has been added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is presented.

Claim 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,014,662 of Moran, et al. ("Moran").

Claims 9 and 26 are objected to because of minor informalities.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to claims 9 and 26. Applicants have amended claims 9 and 26, and submit the Examiner's objections have been overcome.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Moran. Applicants submit that claims 1-30 are not anticipated by Moran. In regard to the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner has stated in part that:

Moran discloses receiving search keyword (Col. 2, lines 19-20) i.e. "The present invention provides a user interface that does much of the work in searching and organizing of search data. It defines search terms and sources ahead of time for subjects that have wide usage, or are suggested by the user" and catching [sic] the search results (9/3/03, Office Action, p. 3)

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that claims 1-30 are not anticipated by Moran. Claim 1 recites the feature of "receiving search criteria entered by a user, wherein the

search criteria includes at least one search keyword...” (Emphasis added) This feature is not disclosed by Moran. Infact, Moran’s invention teaches the opposite. Moran states: “Users can search vast archives with a search and retrieve component to find the latest information. They do this by selecting the appropriate briefing book subject, and do not have to prepare a proper set of keywords.” (Moran, col. 6, ll. 30-33). Thus, Moran does not use keywords as claimed by applicants.

Moran also fails to disclose “caching the search results to maintain persistency of the search results.” (Claim 1) (emphasis added) Moran teaches “displaying the search results of the selected section of the book whereby different versions of the book can be provided to different users” (Moran, col. 7 ll. 16-19). Displaying the search results is not “caching the search results to maintain persistency of the search results,” as stated in applicants’ claim 1. Furthermore, Moran’s search results are provided from a web server in network server 1200, and does not describe caching. (Moran, Fig. 12)

Because Moran does not disclose “receiving search criteria entered by a user, wherein the search criteria includes at least one search keyword” or “caching the search results to maintain persistency...” as taught by claim 1 for the reasons above, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-9 which depend from claim 1, are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Moran.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 10 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 1, and recites “receiving a search category and a search keyword entered by a user” and “caching the search results to maintain persistency of the search results...” (Emphasis added) Because Moran does not disclose these feature as taught by applicants’ claim 10 from which claims 11-15 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-15 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Moran.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 16 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 1, and recites “a user interface to receive search criteria entered by a user, wherein the search criteria includes at least one search keyword” and “a business service... to cache the search results to maintain persistency...” (Emphasis added) Because Moran does not disclose these features as taught by applicants’ claim 16 from which claims 17-20 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-20 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Moran.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 21 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 39, and recites “a user interface to receive search criteria entered by a user, wherein the search criteria includes at least one search keyword.” (Emphasis added) Because Moran does not disclose these features as taught by applicants’ claim 21 from which claims 22-26 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 21-26 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Moran.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 27 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 1, and recites “receiving search criteria entered by a user, wherein the search criteria includes at least one search keyword,” and “caching the search results to maintain persistency of the search results.” (Emphasis added) Because Moran does not disclose these features as taught by applicants’ claim 27 from which claims 28-31 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 27-31 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Moran.

Application No.: 09/883,623
Amtd. Dated September 26, 2003
Reply to Office Action of 9/3/03

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Sept. 26th, 2003

Sanjeet K. Dutta

Sanjeet K. Dutta

Reg. No. 46,145

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 947-8200